REMARKS

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application 2001/0032090 – Moneim et al. in view U.S. Patent Application 2004/0064352 – Gordon et al. These claims are considered to be patentable for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method "used by a first application for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications" comprising "receiving user identification information; initiating authentication of said user identification information; communicating a URL to a managing application for storage, said URL being for use in acquiring a web page providing a single logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications individually requiring user logon information in response to said authenticated user identification information; and automatically communicating application specific context information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications in response to a user command to initiate execution of said particular application and in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu". These features are not shown or suggested in Gordon with Moneim.

As recognized in the Rejection on page 3, Moneim does not show or suggest "automatically communicating application specific context information to a particular application". Such application specific context information includes a patient identifier or user identifier, for example (Application page 10 lines 35-37). Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 3, Gordon in the Abstract and paragraph 3 describes a web site for administering sports leagues using sports data entered by users (paragraphs, 9, 15 and 18) and has no bearing on "automatically communicating **application specific context** information to a particular application". The claimed system advantageously "automatically" communicates "**application specific context** information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications" such as a patient identifier "in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu". Thereby the system enables a user to logon to a first application such as a patient census application and gain automatic access to multiple other applications such as a medical laboratory test result application and in response to user activation of the test result application, be **automatically provided** with desired test results for the specific patient selected in the first patient administration

application (see the example described in the Application on page 5 lines 6-10 and elsewhere in connection with Figure 2). This is done without the user having to re-enter context information (e.g., a patient identifier) by link selection or another command following automatic logon to a second application. This capability is not shown or suggested in Gordon with Moneim.

Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 3 Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system that "automatically" communicates "**application specific context** information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications" such as a patient identifier "in **response to automatic logon** to said particular application via said single logon menu". The combination of Gordon with Moneim nowhere shows or suggests such features. Gordon paragraph 18 indicates "typically, the league member and/or league administrator **inputs** the external information (member name, play date, score, etc.) **using a keyboard** or keypad associated with the terminal. However, an alternate input device 23 can be used such as a scanner to read score cards or a voice recognition system to accept spoken external information". Gordon (with Moneim) does not contemplate or suggest "automatically" communicating "application specific context information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications" such as a patient identifier "in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu".

The user entered sports data in Gordon (paragraphs 9, 15, 18) is NOT context information facilitating intra-application communication and seamless operation of applications (see Application page 4 lines 23-29, page 14 lines 36-37). Context information is well known to one of ordinary skill as comprising information concerning "circumstances in which a particular event" (invoking operation of an executable application) "occurs" (Webster II New College Dictionary 1995). Context information is exemplified in the Application as a patient identifier (page 8 line 12) and does NOT include user entered sports related data "member name, play date, score etc" provided to a web site for administering sports leagues. Further, the Gordon sports data is sent in response to manual data entry and user command (Gordon paragraph 18) and NOT "in **response to automatic logon** to said particular application via said single logon menu".

Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 3 Gordon with Moneim does NOT render it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the claimed features. The Moneim reference merely discloses a "plug-in that will let user submit

information to a website database…allowing them to participate with heir usernames in websites affiliated to this new method of registration" (paragraph 16). The Moneim system nowhere shows or suggests a system that "automatically" communicates "application specific context information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications" such as a patient identifier "in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu". In the Moneim system, the user submits a user name, email address, password, verifying password" to facilitate "registration, login, payments" (paragraph 16). This information is NOT automatically communicated "application specific context information".

The combination of Gordon with Moneim as suggested in the Rejection results in a system requiring a user to **firstly** login to a first website (paragraph 18 Moneim), **secondly** complete a single line form entering username, email address, password, verifying password (paragraph 19, Figure 1, Moneim) and **thirdly** input external information (member name, play date, score, etc.) using a keyboard or keypad associated with the terminal to be provided to a website (Gordon paragraph 18). Such a combined system does NOT show or suggest a system that "automatically" communicates **"application specific context** information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications" such as a patient identifier "in **response to automatic logon** to said particular application via said single logon menu". Gordon with Moneim fails to suggest "automatically" communicating "application specific context information to a particular application" at all.

Further, there is no 35 USC 112 compliant disclosure in Gordon with Moneim of a system enabling "communicating a URL" of a web page providing a single logon menu to a "managing application for storage". Such a feature advantageously facilitates "user initiation (e.g., logon), operation and termination (e.g., logoff) of multiple Internet applications" and "securely passing URL, patient (and user) identification and other information between applications" (Application page 4 lines 21-25. The combination of single logon page **together with** automatic communication of application specific context information "in response to a user command to initiate execution of said particular application and in response to automatic logon" facilitates user friendly operation and user seamless navigation in a plurality of concurrently operating applications. The system addresses the problems involved in "facilitating user initiation (e.g., logon), operation and termination (e.g., logoff) of multiple Internet applications and in securely passing URL, patient (and user) identification and other information between applications. A managing

application is employed to coordinate user operation sessions. Specifically the managing application coordinates inactivity timeout operation and maintains and conveys properties between concurrent applications in order to **create a smooth user operation session**" (Application page 4 lines 23-29).

In contrast, Moncim (with Gordon) relied on in the Rejection requires a user to enter email address information as part of a registration process supporting confirmation of purchase transactions made via a website, for example. Gordon with Moncim does not disclose "communicating a URL to a managing application for storage, said URL being for use in acquiring a web page providing a single logon menu". The multi-step manual website registration system of Moneim is incompatible with use of a "managing application for storage" of a "URL" for use in "acquiring a web page providing a single logon menu" to "support user access to a plurality of different applications individually requiring user logon information in response to said authenticated user identification information". The Moneim (with Gordon) system does NOT involve "communicating a URL to a managing application" for use in "acquiring a web page providing a single logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications individually requiring user logon information in response to said authenticated user identification information". Gordon with Moneim also does not disclose "automatically communicating application specific context information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications in response to a user command to initiate execution of said particular application and in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu". Gordon with Moneim also fails to show or suggest the combination of these features. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Dependent claim 2 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system in which "said plurality of different applications individually require different user logon information" and "said application specific context information comprises a patient identifier and including the step of automatically using said URL to acquire data representing said web page providing a single logon menu in response to a detected logoff condition". Gordon with Moneim fails to show or suggest automatically communicating "**application specific context** information" between two applications comprising "a **patient identifier**" following automatic logon to the two applications via "a web page providing a single logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different

applications individually requiring **different** user logon information". Further, Gordon with Moneim, fails to suggest "automatically using said URL to acquire data representing said web page providing a single logon menu in response to a **detected logoff** condition". This feature advantageously provides a unified logon page to individual applications following a logoff occurring to an individual application of "said plurality of different applications". Such a capability is not discussed or contemplated in Gordon with Moneim. Gordon with Moneim provides no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of automatically using a common URL of a logon page to automatically support re-logon to an individual application of "said plurality of different applications" in the event of a logoff condition (Application page 17 lines 14-17).

Contrary to the Rejection statement "a **patient identifier**" is not player information as in Gordon. Further, Gordon or Moneim alone or together nowhere discusses mentions or suggests providing seamless operation between applications by automatically communicating "**application specific context** information" between two applications comprising "a **patient identifier**" following automatic logon to the two applications via "a web page providing a single logon menu".

Context information is well known to one of ordinary skill as comprising information concerning "circumstances in which a particular event occurs" (Webster II New College Dictionary 1995), the event being invoking operation of an executable application. Context information is exemplified in the Application as a patient identifier (page 8 line 12). The claimed arrangement advantageously facilitates seamless operation and navigation between applications. In contrast, the combined Moneim and Gordon system necessitates a multi-level manual user logon and registration operation and manual entry of data into individual applications. Such a combined system does NOT show or suggest a system that "automatically" communicates "**application specific context** information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications" such as a patient identifier "in **response to automatic logon** to said particular application via said single logon menu". Gordon with Moneim fails to suggest "automatically" communicating "**application specific context** information to a particular application" at all.

Gordon and Moneim individually (and together) fail to recognize the seamless navigation advantages realized in navigating between applications achieved by the claimed arrangement and fails to recognize the problems addressed by these

advantages. The cited references individually and together also fail to provide any other reason or motivation for providing the claimed arrangement.

Dependent claim 3 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest the feature combination including "communicating additional parameters to said managing application for storage, said additional parameters including one or more of, (a) an authentication service identifier, (b) a language identifier, (c) a frame identifier identifying a browser frame to be used, (d) a timeout value and (e) user identification information and receiving parameters from said managing application including one or more of, (i) a session identifier corresponding to a particular user logon initiation, (ii) a session key for use in encrypting or decrypting URL data and (iii) a parameter identifying success or failure of a request to establish a session". The system of Gordon with Moneim fails to provide a 35 USC 112 compliant enabling description of the feature combination of claim 3 concerning storing parameters by, and receiving parameters from, a "managing application" supporting logon and "user access to a plurality of different applications individually requiring user logon information". The parameters relied on in Moneim are NOT communicated to "a managing application" in **addition** to a "URL...for use in acquiring a web page providing a single logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications individually requiring user logon information" in response to "authenticated user identification information".

Dependent claim 4 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show the feature combination in which "said **URL** is for use in acquiring a web page providing a common logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications including said first application following **termination** of said first application" and "said application specific context information is communicated to said particular application in a **data field** of a **URL**". As previously explained, Gordon with Moneim fails to discuss or contemplate use of "common logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications including said first application following **termination** of said first application". Further, Gordon with Moneim, fails to suggest **automatically** communicating "**application specific context** information" to "said particular application in a **data field** of a **URL**" following automatic logon to the two applications via "a web page providing a single logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications individually requiring different user logon information". Contrary to the

Rejection statement on page 5, Gordon with Moneim does not recognize or mention a logoff condition comprising "**termination** of said first application" and fails to show or suggest providing a "**common logon menu** to support user access to a plurality of different applications including said first application" in response to such "termination". The Moneim email address of Figure 4 is for transaction confirmation, for example and has no relevance to conveying "**application specific context** information" to "said particular application in a **data field** of a **URL**" or to providing a "common logon menu" following "**termination** of said first application".

Dependent claim 5 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 5 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest the feature combination of claim 5. Contrary to the Rejection statement on page 5, Moneim (with Gordon) fails to mention or suggest providing a "**common logon menu** to support user access to a plurality of different applications including said first application" in response to "**termination**".

Dependent claim 6 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1. Claim 6 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest the claim 6 feature combination involving "communicating an authentication service identifier to said managing application; and receiving a user identification code associated with said authentication service from said managing application". The Moneim website user registration function of Moneim paragraph 25 does not show or suggest "communicating an **authentication service** identifier **to** said **managing** application; and receiving a **user identification** code associated with said authentication service **from** said managing application".

Dependent claim 7 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 1 and because of the additional feature combination it comprises. Gordon with Moneim nowhere shows or suggests "communicating a URL to said managing application" by "encrypting said URL and communicating an encoded URL to said managing application". Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest "communicating a URL" of a "logon menu" web page or use of such a "managing application" in the claim context or "encrypting said URL and communicating an encoded URL to said managing application".

Independent claim 8 is considered to be patentable for reasons given in connection with claim 1. Claim 8 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a "browser application for receiving user

identification information and for initiating communication of said user identification information to a second application in response to user selection of an icon displayed in a browser window; a managing application for receiving a URL from said second application for storage, said URL being for use in acquiring a web page providing a single logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications individually requiring user logon information in response to said authenticated user identification information; and a communication processor for automatically communicating application specific context information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications in response to a user command to initiate execution of said particular application and in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu".

The system of Gordon with Moneim fails to suggest use of a "managing application for receiving a URL from said second application for storage" and for "use in acquiring a web page providing" the "single logon menu". Further the combined references fail to suggest these features in combination with "a browser application for receiving user identification information and for initiating communication of said user identification information to a second application in response to user selection of an icon displayed in a browser window". The claimed system advantageously "automatically" communicates **application specific context** information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications" such as a patient identifier "in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu". The combination of single logon page together with automatic communication of application specific context information "in response to a user command to initiate execution of said particular application and in response to automatic logon" facilitates user friendly operation and user seamless navigation in a plurality of concurrently operating applications. These features are nowhere discussed or suggested in Gordon with Moneim.

Dependent claim 9 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3 and 8. Dependent claim 9 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system involving "automatically communicating **application specific context** information to a particular application of said plurality of different applications in response to a user command to initiate execution of said particular application" made "from **within said second application**" and "in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu".

Dependent claim 10 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3 and 8.

Dependent claim 11 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 5 and 8.

Dependent claim 12 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3 and 8.

Dependent claim 13 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and 8.

Dependent claim 14 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 8 and for reasons given in connection with claim 1 and 8.

Independent claim 15 recites a system "supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of Internet compatible applications including first and second applications, comprising: a web browser application including, a user interface display generator for generating a browser window containing icons enabling user initiation of operation of said first and second applications; a menu generator for providing a logon menu common to said plurality of Internet compatible applications individually requiring user logon information by acquiring a web page providing said common logon menu from a logon web page URL address provided to said browser application by said second application, said logon web page URL address being conveyed from said first application to said second application in response to user initiation of said second application via said browser window; and a communication processor for automatically communicating application specific context information to a particular application of said plurality of Internet compatible applications in response to a user command to initiate execution of said particular application and in response to automatic logon to said particular application via said single logon menu". These features are not shown or suggested in Gordon with Moneim for the reasons given in connection with claims 1 and 8.

Dependent claim 16 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15.

Dependent claim 17 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15. Dependent claim 17 is also considered to be patentable

because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system in which "said logon web page URL address is conveyed from said first application to said second application following communication of said URL address to a managing application and retrieval of said URL address from said managing application by said second application". Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system involving a "logon web page URL address" being "conveyed from said **first** application to said **second** application following communication of said URL address to a managing application and retrieval of said URL address from said **managing** application by said second application". Gordon with Moneim does not mention or suggest use of a "logon web page URL address" at all. Fail to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of conveying a "logon web page URL address" from a "**first** application to said **second** application following communication of said URL address to a managing application and retrieval of said URL address from said **managing** application by said second application".

Dependent claim 18 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15. Dependent claim 18 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system in which "said logon web page URL address is conveyed from said first application to other applications of said plurality of Internet compatible applications following activation of said other applications". Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system involving a "logon web page URL address" being "conveyed from said **first** application" to "other applications of said plurality of Internet compatible applications **following activation** of said **other applications**". Gordon with Moneim does not mention or suggest use of a "logon web page URL address" at all.

Dependent claim 19 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 15. Dependent claim 19 is also considered to be patentable because Gordon with Moneim does not show or suggest a system in which a "menu generator provides said logon menu in response to at least one condition of, (a) upon logoff from a session of activity, (b) a termination condition arising from an error condition and (c) upon time-out condition arising due to inactivity of said second application".

Independent claim 20 is considered to be patentable for the reasons given in connection with the preceding claims.

Independent claim 21 recites a system "A system used for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications, comprising: a processor for receiving and storing a URL from a first application, said URL being for use in acquiring a web page providing a single logon menu to support user access to a plurality of different applications; and at least one communication processor for, communicating said URL and a session identifier to a second application of said plurality of different applications individually requiring user logon information in response to a request by said second application to said managing application to establish a session of user operation and automatically communicating application specific context information to said second application of said plurality of different applications in response to a user command to initiate execution of said second application and in response to automatic logon to said second application via said single logon menu". These features are not shown or suggested in Gordon with Moneim for the reasons given in connection with claims 1, 3 and 8 and for additional reasons.

Amended dependent claim 22 is considered to be patentable based on its dependence on claim 21 and for reasons given in connection with claims 1, 19 and 21.

Independent method claims 23 and 24 mirror apparatus claims 21 and 15 respectively and are considered to be patentable for similar reasons. Consequently withdrawal of the Rejection of claim 1-24 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Information disclosure statement

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed on May 1, 2006 identifying U.S. Patent No. 6,971,067; 6,941,313 and 6,993,556 for consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that these Patents neither disclose nor suggest the present invention as claimed in claims 1 – 24. Therefore, Applicant further respectfully submits that systems disclosed in these patents provide no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure that would make the present claimed invention unpatentable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander J. Burke
Reg. No. 40,425

Date: June 12, 2006

Alexander J. Burke
Intellectual Property Department
Siemens Corporation,
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, N.J. 08830
Tel. 732 321 3023
Fax 732 321 3030